

## COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

**July 20, 2004**

Mayor Baines called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Roy, Gatsas, Guinta, Sysyn, Osborne, Porter, O'Neil, Lopez, Shea, DeVries, Garrity, Smith, Thibault and Forest

Ratify and confirm poll conducted June 18, 2004 unanimously approving the 2005 CIP budget authorizations as follows:

411205	Neighborhood Speed Enforcement
510505	Art Builds Community
510605	Pavilion Installation
510705	Summer Concerts & Event Support
510805	After School Program
510905	Palace Operations
511005	Annual Park Maintenance Program
610005	Operational Expenses (Spruce Street)
610205	Building Improvement Program
610405	Infrastructure/Hardscape Improvements
612805	Manchester Area Convention & Visitors Bureau
612905	City Gardens
613005	Annual Millyard Project Expense
710105	Old Wellington Road Improvements
710605	Annual ROW Maintenance (Resurfacing)
710805	Downtown Infrastructure Repairs
811105	Municipal Deferred Maintenance Cash Program

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Shea it was voted to ratify and confirm the poll conducted.

Bond Resolutions:

“Authorizing, Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of One Million Six Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$1,600,000) for the 2005 CIP 411305, South Main Street Fire Station Rehabilitation Project.”

“Authorizing, Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Two Million Four Hundred and Ten Thousand Dollars (\$2,410,000) for the 2005 CIP 510005, Park Facilities Improvement Program.”

“Authorizing, Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Two Million Five Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$2,500,000) for the 2005 CIP 710005, Major Fleet Upgrades Project.”

“Authorizing, Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of One Million Seven Hundred and Ten Thousand Dollars (\$1,710,000) For the 2005 CIP 710205, Public Works Infrastructure Project.”

“Authorizing, Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Two Hundred Eighty Thousand Dollars (\$280,000) for the 2005 CIP 710905, Parking & Traffic Improvements Project.”

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Six Million Eighty Thousand Dollars (\$6,080,000) for the 2005 CIP 711105, CSO-Phase 1 (Bremer Street) Project.”

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000) for the 2005 CIP 711205, Replace Sludge Dewatering Equipment Project.”

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000) for the 2005 CIP 711405, WSPS – Roof/HVAC/Piping Project.”

“Authorizing, Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Two Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$250,000) for the 2005 CIP 811305, Revaluation Update Project.”

“Authorizing, Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Four Million Four Hundred Forty Thousand Dollars (\$4,440,000) for the 2005 CIP 811405, Building Improvements Project.”

“Authorizing, Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of One Million Six Hundred Ninety Thousand Dollars (\$1,690,000) for the 2005 CIP 811505, Information/Public Safety Upgrades Project.”

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Shea it was voted to dispense with the reading by titles only.

Alderman O'Neil moved that the Bond Resolutions ought to pass and layover. Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion.

Alderman DeVries stated dealing with the Bond Resolutions included in that would be the \$250,000 for the City's revaluation update project and as stated at the last full Board meeting I certainly was not at all opposed to this being included in the two year CIP Cash project that we put through but I do not feel that this current year is the proper year for us to go forward with the revaluation project. We do need to go forward with our funding of this so that it can be done in the next calendar year not in this calendar year. That is my personal opinion and I wish that this particular item included in this item could be pulled off and be presented separately so that it will be independent of the rest of the bond resolutions. I will make a motion to that effect.

Mayor Baines stated there is already a motion on the floor to move this and it has been seconded. If you wish to be recorded as voting on a certain item we could do that as policy of the Board.

Alderman DeVries responded well I certainly will do that. Thank you, your Honor.

Alderman Porter stated I think this is a very important issue and I have been dealing with the thought of the revaluation coming up in tax year 05. Right now we are nearly into August of 2004. The values will be placed on the properties as of April 1, 2005. This would give approximately six or seven months before that tax base year begins. I don't believe there is anywhere near enough time to do a high quality job in that short a period. Through no fault of the Board of Assessors they do not have the experience to do a statistical analysis type of revaluation, which is the only way it can be done. I have always gone by the theory that there are no good revaluations, some are just worse than others. Every revaluation is fraught with different problems. I myself have been through two full revaluations. To do a city the size of Manchester requires an enormous amount of time. I think it is totally inappropriate to do it in a statistical analysis basis. This means they are not going to be looking at people's properties. By the time this is implemented we will be four years away from the prior revaluation. The data that was collected, I

think, for the most part has been good. If this were a year following a revaluation and they were going to do a statistical analysis, which I think is the ultimate goal and whether they reach it or not remains to be seen, then I think it would be okay. There is another problem with putting the new assessments on the second bill of a tax year. The way the scenario would play out to me is that somewhere somehow around May the revaluation or analysis would be started or the data collected in which to do it. They will have a couple of months for hearings, probably into September or October depending upon the timeframe. When the bills go out in November, any further adjustments and there will be an enormous amount of abatement requests which will result in a change of assessment but accompanied with a change in assessment will be a credit or a cash refund commensurate to the amount of the assessment abated. I would predict that this would result in an additional expense and an overlay of about \$1.5 million. If we put the bills out on the first billing, which is impossible for April of 2005 and I think the Assessors would agree, if we put it out on the first bill that means the hearings have already been held by the revaluation company. After the bill goes out and people see their new assessments if they come in the Assessors would then have the entire summer, four or five months, to hold hearings in the office. Any changes made to the assessment prior to the bill going out would eliminate the need for an abatement. It would be retroactive to April 1. We are looking at a timeframe for six months to defer it to April 1, 2006 instead of sending it out in November 2005. It is probably going to cost the City \$1.5 million more in the overlay because of this. If we are looking for roughly an \$8 billion tax base, which I wouldn't be surprised is what I have looked at just by using the ratio, if we use a 2% reduction in that tax base you are looking at a substantial amount of potential abatement. 2% of \$8 billion is \$160 million. It could conceivable mean abatements in the \$3 or \$4 million range for an overlay. I think that if we give the Assessors enough time to give the revaluation company ample time to do a quality job, the citizens will be better served. I am not concerned with what the DRA might do. They can do what they want to do. My concern would be with the Board of Tax and Land Appeals. Having worked with them for many, many years as an Assessor, they have been more than fair and they have often times leaned over backwards to assist communities. We just saw that Bedford did a revaluation after 17 years. We are looking at three or four years. It is too short. The Board of Tax and Land Appeals, if we have something in place to go forward with a revaluation, will not come in to Manchester and make unreasonable dictations as was hinted by the members of the DRA who spoke to this group. I don't think it was necessary to have Mr. Pattell down to intimidate this Board and tell us why we should do it. We can all read the statutes and if we do it in 2006 that will be five years, which certainly meets the Constitutional requirements of the State of New Hampshire. I think, your Honor, with all due respect this is far too important an issue just to gloss over and get it done. I think this should definitely be taken up as a separate

item. Perhaps whoever made the motion could withdraw the motion to vote on this and then we could revote with that taken out as a separate issue.

Alderman Gatsas stated I have a parliamentary question. This bond resolution needs 10 votes.

Deputy City Clerk responded not this evening. This evening it is a majority vote because it is a layover vote. It is not the final adoption. The final adoption will require 10 votes, which would not come until August 3 presuming it makes it out of Committee.

Alderman Gatsas stated I would go along with Alderman Porter and ask that the maker of the motion remove this item so that we don't get into a problem in the next meeting that the entire resolution goes down if there aren't sufficient votes.

Alderman O'Neil stated we have debated this thing for a number of months. Out of a courtesy to my colleagues I am willing to withdraw my motion but I don't prefer to see this thing go on all night either. We have talked about this a number of times. There unfortunately are different opinions among Board members on this issue but as a courtesy I will withdraw my motion.

Alderman Sysyn withdrew her second.

Mayor Baines stated I will now accept a motion that the Bond Resolutions ought to pass and layover with the exception of the one regarding revaluation.

Alderman O'Neil moved that the Bond Resolutions, with the exception of the revaluation resolution, ought to pass and layover. Alderman Porter duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Roy asked as part of that will we be able to have further discussion on the revaluation.

Mayor Baines answered I am going to go back to that after we vote that will be a separate motion.

Alderman DeVries stated you are going to love coming back over to this side of the room. I would like to hear on CIP item 710205. Part of that if I am correct included the impound lot that was going to be constructed up at Derryfield Park. It is not clear in my mind after the last Board meeting where that particular item sits.

Mayor Baines stated there is no determined site at this time. It won't be at Derryfield Park. I think that has been ruled out from what I heard.

Alderman Lopez stated I was personally told that it was going to be up at Derryfield Park by the Highway Department.

Mr. Frank Thomas stated the Derryfield Park location has wetlands. We have met with the Conservation Commission and they have concerns about constructing a parking lot up in that area because of the wetlands and also because of the need to cut down some trees. However, we are looking at different locations throughout the City. We are evaluating JFK. If that doesn't prove effective there still may be a need to build a smaller parking facility up at Derryfield and maybe develop something over at the West Side Arena.

Alderman Lopez replied I just wanted to clarify that because we didn't have that piece of information on the wetlands at the last Committee meeting.

Alderman Gatsas stated Frank I would assume that there would be a closer communication with the Alderman of the ward that you are looking to put this impound lot in rather than just arbitrarily other people knowing about it.

Mr. Thomas responded well first of all we were trying to determine whether it would be feasible in that location. During the budget process we noted that there was a need for a car impoundment area because of the loss of the one down at Singer field and I believe at that time we did note to the Board that we were looking at Derryfield.

Alderman Gatsas stated looking at it and making that decision are two different things.

Mayor Baines responded that is fair. I will make sure that there is communication.

Mayor Baines called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion that the Bond Resolutions, with the exception of the revaluation resolution, ought to pass and layover carried.

Alderman Roy moved the Bond Resolution:

“Authorizing, Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Two Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$250,000) for the 2005 CIP 811305, Revaluation Update Project.”

for discussion. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion

Alderman Roy stated I would like to clarify a few facts that were discussed earlier this evening. The first was the comment that this has been glossed over. This Aldermanic Board has worked diligently in trying to come up with a fair and equal process for the citizens of Manchester. While I do agree with Alderman Porter that no revaluation is a good revaluation for the taxpayer or homeowner or business owner, I do feel that our last revaluation was one of the poorest conducted in the City in recent history or in any city in recent history. Ward 1 really took a hit and I do feel that we are being very unfairly taxed and I do support doing this revaluation to create a fair and equitable tax base throughout the City. I do further believe that having \$5.279 billion of an unfair tax base is far worse than having \$8 million of a fair tax base equalized throughout the City.

Alderman Guinta asked are we going to take a vote on this tonight.

Mayor Baines answered yes it is a majority vote and then it goes to the next meeting for a final vote.

Alderman Guinta stated I am going to have to abstain and I didn't make this point the last time we voted and there might have been some question about it. I was appointed to the Assessing Standards Board by the Governor so I am going to abstain on this issue.

Alderman Gatsas asked when this comes forward at the next meeting will it be a stand alone item or will it be included with the Bond Resolutions.

Mayor Baines answered it will be a stand alone item. Again, I just want to remind the Board that we were told very clearly by the DRA that we are putting the City in a very difficult situation if we don't proceed and I discussed this with the City Solicitor who indicated that if we don't do this it is like rolling the dice and the impact to the City could be substantial as was pointed out by the DRA. I wanted to remind the Board that that is out there. Whether we like it or not we were told very clearly and we had a letter from the Commissioner of DRA stating exactly what the ramifications are and I would like to call the Chief of Assessors forward to just remind the Board about what we were told. You can all dismiss it if you

want but I just want it on the record as a reminder of what the Chief Assessor has been told and what we have been told as a City that we must do.

Mr. Steve Tellier, Chairman, Board of Assessors stated basically our understanding is that in rolling the dice we hazard changing what could effectively be approximately a \$750,000 job. There are two firms out there that would apply. One of them is the firm that we had recommended to a previous board. We got the lowest bidder. Those two firms will apply again. However, should this Board not vote to enact this funding mechanism we take the chance that the Department of Revenue Administration does submit our community's non-compliance to the Board of Tax and Land Appeals and they, in the past, have always ordered a full "scratch job" and in this sort of job the cost would probably exceed \$2.3 or \$2.4 million.

Mayor Baines stated just for the record so that everybody knows and we are not saying that is definitely going to happen.

Mr. Tellier stated I can't speak for the Board of Tax and Land Appeals. I am just informing the Board of what historically has occurred.

Mayor Baines responded I appreciate it and in discussing it with the City Solicitor he described it exactly the same way. We might prevail and we might not but if we don't prevail that is the outcome that could happen just so people know the risk.

Alderman Porter stated your Honor you used the term rolling the dice.

Mayor Baines replied those are the City Solicitor's words.

Alderman Porter responded whoever. I think the City rolled the dice on the Verizon Center to the tune of a \$50 million bond and I think it has worked out very well. It is costing us a little bit every year but I think the expense and the investment was worth it. We rolled the dice on \$27.5 million for a baseball stadium. We roll the dice on any major votes that we make so to speak. I am not asking to cancel the revaluation. I am not asking that it be put off for five years. I am simply saying that to give the Assessors more time to do it would be far better. That would eliminate the rolling of the dice. I think that for the Assessors to go to school on a revaluation that is going to be done through statistical analysis is rolling the dice at the expense of the taxpayers and nowhere have I heard the taxpayers brought in. It is always DRA. Let DRA do what they want to do. The Board of Tax and Land Appeals will not order the City to do a revaluation if we



have one planned and you know what? If they did there is no penalty and Steve perhaps it is better to do a scratch revaluation. I don't know how you could possibly sit there and say that it would be better to do it this way than with a scratch revaluation. I don't know how you could say that.

Mr. Tellier stated for the purpose of the Board I am not going to rehash past arguments. We have presented our data. We are pretty comfortable that our data is quite reasonably accurate. This was our best presentation to the Board and serving the taxpayers to be as cost effective as we can this was our recommendation at this point.

Alderman Gatsas stated correct me if I am wrong but I believe DRA was here and they stated that if we went forward with a full scratch revaluation that they wouldn't take us to the Board of Tax and Land Appeals because there was one in place and it was moving forward as a full scratch appraisal or revaluation.

Mr. Tellier responded I do recall them stating that but they were talking about that in 2005. So the logistics of the timing and how long it takes for stuff to pass through the Board of Tax and Land Appeals I think referred to Alderman Porter's observation that if we waited until 2006 because we had a full scratch job they may not submit it.

Alderman Gatsas asked wouldn't you agree that even if they ordered it you couldn't get it done in that timeframe anyway.

Mr. Tellier answered that is correct.

Alderman Gatsas stated so I don't think they would be unreasonable. They would tell you to do it in 2006 just as though we would be planning to go forward with a full scratch.

Mr. Tellier responded it has occurred in the past as well that the Board of Tax and Land Appeals not only ordered the full job but ordered remedial action to be done in the preceding year to correct glaring deficiencies as well. So the community has taken a two-year hit of some kind in some of those instances. That has occurred as well.

Alderman Roy asked what would be the price of a full scratch assessment.

Mr. Tellier answered if we were to go into it voluntarily and this is my best estimate at this point, \$2.2 or \$2.3 million probably. If the Board orders one there

is a level of oversight that adds a premium to a full scratch job so that would clearly exceed \$2.4 and maybe as much as \$2.5 million.

Alderman Roy asked and a statistic revaluation.

Mr. Tellier answered when we asked for requests for information last year based on this we had two bids. One was for \$750,000 and the other was for \$815,000 and both vendors have indicated that they are going to bid very aggressively to try and get the job.

Alderman Roy asked do you feel with our last revaluation that the problem is with the values or the data collected.

Mr. Tellier answered the values are out of line.

Alderman Roy asked so the difference between a statistical and a scratch is the measuring of the properties.

Mr. Tellier answered yes. With a scratch revaluation they put a tape measure to every property again. That is the difference. In a scratch job it is clearly  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the time that it takes to do that and the bulk of the cost as well.

Alderman Roy asked so the data is correct and for three times the price we can be forced into this in 2006.

Mr. Tellier replied what we are saying is that our data, according to Assessing Standards Board rules, is reasonably accurate. That is our best offer to be cost effective to the taxpayer.

Alderman DeVries stated I would just like to remind the rest of the Board that should we not have the votes to support this by majority tonight to go through because I think there are quite a few of us who are opposed to the Assessor's Office going forward in 2005, we still need to come back immediately and address because we are dealing in a two year CIP budget if I recollect. It is 2005-2006 for the cash component so we still need to come back and make a motion to allow the Assessor's Office to go forward for the 2006 revaluation. I will call for the vote at this time.

Alderman Lopez stated if I understand this correctly if this \$250,000 goes down we are not saying you cannot go forward. You as the Assessor...you have \$500,000 and if you still wanted to go forward under the law that you had stated you had the right to do as the Assessor you could still move forward. Now correct

me if I am wrong. I understand the \$250,000 though that you say you need but if you wanted to move forward you could move forward with the \$500,000 and the personnel that you have. Am I correct or incorrect?

Mr. Tellier responded you are incorrect Alderman. We just don't have the resources for the magnitude of the job that you are doing. However, what we could do is look at the most glaring deficiencies and the differences between different property types and we could do some adjusting but what we are doing is prolonging the pain.

Alderman Lopez asked you are prolonging the pain for the taxpayers or who.

Mr. Tellier answered what you would see is only those...one of the first things we would have to look at is vacant land and some of the other strata of properties, commercial properties. We have different areas of commercial properties that have increased. We have areas of the City that have increased quicker than other areas. We have vacant land issues that have to be corrected so basically what our Board would entertain is looking at what we could do but clearly we will not meet Assessing Standards Board rules. The first criteria is that assessments must fall between 90% and 110% of value. We will fail our assessment review. That is the first tenant and we just will fail. Then after that as was clearly stated in the Department of Revenue Commissioner's letter, they would submit our name to the Board of Tax and Land Appeals who has the authority to order a revaluation and also has, legislatively the DRA has the enforcement provision to contract the job out and put the entire amount on the next tax rate. Now we have \$500,000 but they would put it on there anyway. Plus you would add that premium and that level of oversight and take Manchester out of the driver's seat.

Alderman Lopez stated I have one other question. This is a two year project and we have \$250,000...let's just say for sake of argument that it did not pass and we didn't give you the \$250,000 to proceed and you failed the inspection. Then you would have to implement some type of plan to present to them maybe along with some of the dates that have been mentioned here – April 2005 for example. So you would have a plan. You wouldn't just stop. You would have to inspect it and say you don't meet the qualifications and what is your plan. You would have to come up with some type of plan. Am I correct?

Mr. Tellier responded we would but if we don't have the funding mechanism available it is pretty hard to have a plan. We would probably enter into deliberations with the City Solicitor to talk about how we would go to the Board of Tax and Land Appeals to defend the fact that the City is in non-compliance.

Mayor Baines called for a vote. Alderman Garrity requested a roll call vote.

Alderman O'Neil asked for clarification of the motion.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson answered the motion is that the Bond Resolution regarding the revaluation ought to pass and layover.

Aldermen Garrity, Smith, Gatsas, Porter, Lopez and DeVries voted nay.  
Aldermen Thibault, Forest, Roy, Sysyn, Osborne, O'Neil and Shea voted yea.  
Alderman Guinta abstained. The motion carried.

Mayor Baines stated again if this doesn't get 10 votes at the next meeting it does not proceed and then we will see what happens. Again, as I have said publicly before and I will say it again no one likes to go through a revaluation but we all take an oath to uphold the law and I think it has been very clearly defined that we have a legal obligation to proceed but the Board will proceed at its own risk.

#### Resolutions:

“Amending the FY 2001 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Two Hundred Fifty Five Thousand Nine Hundred Seventeen Dollars and Eighty One Cents (\$255,917.81) for the FY2001 CIP 840001 MCTV-PEG Access Grant Project.”

“Authorizing the Finance Officer to effect a transfer of Seventy Five Thousand Seven Hundred Seventy Four Dollars and Eighty Seven Cents (\$75,774.87) for the 2002 CIP 714302, Bridge Rehabilitation Project.”

“Amending the FY 2002 & 2003 Community Improvement Program, transferring, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Seventy Five Thousand Seven Hundred Seventy Four Dollars and Eighty Seven Cents (\$75,774.87) for the FY2002 CIP 714302 Bridge Rehabilitation Project.”

“Amending the FY2003 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Thirty Thousand Five Hundred Thirty Six Dollars (\$30,536) for FY2003 CIP 610403 Downtown Municipal Infrastructure Project.”

“Amending the 2004 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Forty Five Thousand Two Dollars (\$45,002) for 2004 CIP 410704 Streetsweeper.”

“Amending the FY2004 Community Improvement Program, transferring, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$100,000) for FY2004 CIP 612304 MNHS Homebuyer Assistance Program.”

“Amending the FY2004 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Thirty Thousand Dollars (\$30,000) for FY2004 CIP 713204 Public Works ROW Improvement Project.”

“Amending the FY2005 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Hundred Twelve Thousand Ten Dollars (\$112,010) for the 2005 CIP 214005 Wrap For Youth Resiliency Project.”

“Amending the FY2005 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Two Hundred Forty Two Thousand Nine Hundred Sixty Four Dollars (\$242,964) for the 2005 CIP 410005 Comprehensive Wellness Matching Grant Program.”

“Amending the FY2005 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Fourteen Thousand Nine Hundred Ninety Three Dollars (\$14,993.00) for FY2005 CIP 411405 Project Safe Neighborhoods Program.”

“Amending the FY2005 Community Improvement Program, transferring, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$150,000) for FY2005 CIP 610105 Second Street Mill Project.”

“Amending the FY2005 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Seven Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$750,000) for the 2005 CIP 710205 Public Works Infrastructure Program.”

“Amending the FY2005 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Sixteen

Thousand Dollars (\$16,000.00) for the 2005 CIP 811605 Valley Cemetery Improvement Project.”

“Authorizing the Finance Officer to Make Certain Budgetary Closings for the Year 2004.”

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Forest it was voted to dispense with the reading by titles only.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Sysyn it was voted that the Resolutions ought to pass and be Enrolled.

CIP Budget Authorizations:

840001	MCTV-PEG Access Grant – Revision #1
714302	Bridge Rehabilitation – Revision #2
713203	Notre Dame/Bridge Street Bridge Repair – Revision #2-Closeout
610403	Downtown Municipal Infrastructure Improvements – Revision #2
410704	Streetsweeper – Revision #2
612304	MNHS Homebuyer Assistance – Revision #1
713204	Public Works ROW Improvement Project – Revision #1
210605	Alcohol & Drug Abuse Prevention
210705	Firesafe Intervention
210805	Equipment Purchase
210905	Operational
211005	Runaway and Homeless Youth
211105	Teen Health Clinic
211205	Transportation Project
211305	Facility Improvements
211405	Girls Center Program
211505	Varney Street Building
211605	Center City Disease
211705	Children’s Oral Health Collaborative
211805	Pharmaceutical Program
211905	Childcare Center
212005	Community & Multicultural Services
212105	Latin American Center Facility Improvements
212205	Training for Legal Interpreters
212305	VNA Child Care & Family Resource
212405	Youth Opportunities Unlimited

212505	Local Emergency Services
212605	Child to Adult Matched Mentoring
212705	Homemaker Services
212805	Manchester Child Care Coordinator
212905	Child Health Services – Operational
213005	Manchester Team
213105	Support to Abused & Neglected Children
213205	International Center Program
213305	Operating Expenses
213405	Pharmacy Program Coordinator
213605	Woman To Woman
213705	Info Bank
213805	Voluntary Action Center
213905	Elder Nutrition Programs
214005	Wrap for Youth Resiliency Project
310005	6% Incentive Education Camperships
310105	Employment & Training
310305	School Projects
410005	Comprehensive Wellness Matching Grant
410505	NH DWI Patrol Program
411105	Hazard Tree Removal
411305	South Main Street Fire Station Rehabilitation
411405	Project Safe Neighborhoods
510005	Park Facilities Improvement Program
510105	Youth Recreation Program
510205	Fun In The Sun/Special Sports
510305	Parks & Recreation Master Plan
510405	Youth Recreation Activities
511205	Gill Stadium Equipment
610105	Second Street Mill – Revision #1
610305	Holiday Lighting
610505	Project Greenstreets
610605	Incubator/Program Support
610705	Operation Support
610805	Capital Repairs (Amherst & Spruce Streets)
610905	Emergency Transitional Housing
611005	Renovations for ADA Compliance
611105	Capital Improvements
611205	Operational
611305	Downpayment & Closing Cost Assistance
611405	Neighborworks Homeownership
611505	Renaissance 8 Predevelopment
611605	NHLA Fair Housing/Tenants Rights

611705	Capital Improvements
611805	New Horizons Operations
611905	Shelter Staffing Costs
612005	Housing Rehabilitation Program (Home)
612105	Neighborhood Revitalization Program
612205	628 Hanover Street Elderly Housing Project
612305	Healthy Home
612405	Homeless Prevention
612505	Tenant Assistance – Security Deposits & Rental Asst.
612605	Capital Improvements
612705	Emily’s Place Operations
710005	Major Fleet Upgrades
710205	Public Works Infrastructure
710305	Infrastructure ADA Access Improvements
710405	Municipal Infrastructure
710505	Two Passenger Lift Vans
710705	Chronic Drain
710905	Parking & Traffic Improvements
711005	Cohas Brook Interceptor – Phase II Design
711105	CSO-Phase I (Bremer Street)
711205	Replace Sludge Dewatering Equipment
711305	Sewer Infrastructure
711405	WSPS – Roof/HVAC/Piping
711505	WWTF Incinerator Retrofit
810005	Computer Network
810105	Replace Transit Radio System
810205	Software – ADA Scheduling
810305	VISTA Coordinator
810405	ADA Compliance
810505	ADA Compliance
810605	Community Development Initiatives
810705	Community Master Plan
810805	Natural Resource Protection
810905	Planning Administration
811005	Special Projects Planner
811205	Employee Training & Development
811305	Revaluation Update
811405	Building Improvements
811505	Information/Public Safety Upgrades
811605	Valley Cemetery Improvement Project



Alderman Shea moved that the CIP budget authorizations be approved subject to final adoption of all related resolutions. Alderman Sysyn duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Gatsas stated I have discussion on three of them. 511205, Gill Stadium Equipment; 810405, ADA Compliance; and 811305 Revaluation Update. The Gill Stadium Equipment I don't remember seeing that in the CIP budget.

Alderman O'Neil stated the CIP Committee had this discussion this evening. It was an agenda item. It was part of the Enterprise funding for \$100,000. What has yet to be determined is the funding source to pay the Enterprise. Parks & Recreation was asked to work with the CIP staff as well as Finance to identify how that will be paid for. It was confirmed that it was part of the...it did receive approval for \$100,000 in the CIP budget under the Enterprise.

Alderman Gatsas stated the next one is 810405, ADA Compliance. It seems as though that is part of wages. Is that correct?

Mr. Robert MacKenzie, Planning Director, stated there are a couple of different projects. One does provide a portion of a position in the HR Department in order to meet the Justice Department requirements for ADA. It is not a full position, it is a partial position.

Alderman Gatsas asked isn't that a position that we eliminated less than two years ago.

Ms. Virginia Lamberton, HR Director, stated we are talking about a couple of different things here. Prior to the full-time position being eliminated, the salary of that incumbent was charged against this account - whatever hours she spent or her secretary spent working on ADA matters. That position also did training. Upon the elimination of that position, Red Robidas and I jointly assumed the responsibilities of the ADA and I assumed the training responsibilities. Given the City Solicitor's advice, I can't charge for my services but they can charge for Red's services so when Red does ADA activities, it gets put on his timesheet and then it gets deducted from this account.

Alderman Gatsas asked is that an increase of wages.

Ms. Lamberton answered no.

Alderman Gatsas asked where does the money come from.

Mr. MacKenzie answered that is CDBG funds from HUD and that is an allowable expense under the HUD program.

Alderman Gatsas asked were those funds being used for the prior position that was there.

Ms. Lamberton answered yes but all of the money was never expended frankly. There were never enough hours to be charged against the account to exhaust the account.

Alderman Gatsas stated the other item is the 810305, which is the revaluation. Are we going to vote on that separately again?

Mayor Baines asked would that be required Carol.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson answered it is not required. If they want they can be recorded as opposed to that item or you could separate it out. It is up to the Board.

Mayor Baines called for a vote. The motion carried with Aldermen Gatsas, DeVries, Garrity, Smith, Porter and Lopez voting in opposition.

Alderman Gatsas asked is that going to work the same way in the next meeting that if there are not 10 votes...

Mayor Baines interjected it will be a separate item.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated this would not come up at the next meeting. If you look the motion was actually to approve it subject to final adoption of related resolutions. If the Bond Resolution does not go forward then the budget authorization is not approved.

Mayor Baines stated so it is really a mute point.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Thibault, duly seconded by Alderman Garrity it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

City Clerk